REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courteous and helpful interview of May 11, 2006 during which the present claim amendments and the prior art were discussed.

Applicants have amended Claims 19 and 29 in an effort to clarify the present invention.

Claims 19-29 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of a combination of Behin (U.S. 6,593,677) and McClelland (U.S. 6,201,629) and McDonald (U.S. 5,774,604). Reconsideration and removal of that rejection is respectfully requested in view of the present amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

In Claim 29, the inner frame 220 includes an upper first portion 221, a lower second portion 222, and an insulating layer 260 sandwiched between the first portion 221 and the second portion 222, whereas the outer frame 230 includes an upper first portion 231, a lower second portion 234, and an insulating layer 260 sandwiched between the first portion 231 and the second portion 234 of the outer frame 230. On this basis, claim 29 further requires that the outer torsion connector 250 comprise a plurality of torsion bars 251, 252 connected to a same side of the inner frame, that at least one, 251, of the torsion bars connect the first portion 221 (that is inherently insulated from the second portion 222 due to the sandwiched insulating layer 260) of the inner frame 220 to the first portion 231 (that is inherently insulated from the second portion 234 due to the sandwiched insulating layer 260) of the outer frame 230 to provide a first electrical conducting path, and that at least another 252 of the torsion bars connect the second portion 222 (that is inherently insulated from the first portion 221 due to the sandwiched insulating layer) of the inner frame 220 to the second

portion 234 (that is inherently insulated from the first portion 231 due to the sandwiched insulating layer 260) of the outer frame 230 to provide a second electrical conducting path which is electrically separate from the first electrical conducting path. Similar limitations are also found in claim 19.

In the Office Action, it is stated that Behin et al. (U.S. 6,593,677) teaches at least one of the torsion bars connecting the frame body of the inner frame to the frame member of the outer frame, and at least another of the torsion bars connecting the electrode base of the inner frame to the auxiliary portion of the outer frame. However, both of the outer torsion bars 512 are connected to the inner frame 511 and to the outer frame in the same manner, and only one of the outer torsion bars 512 is used for forming a conductor pattern 508. Thus, Behin fails to teach or suggest not only the claimed insulating layer but also the idea of utilizing two torsion bars of the outer torsion connector on the same side for forming a first electrical conducting path that connects a first portion (electrically separated from a second portion via a sandwiched insulating layer) of the inner frame to a first portion (electrically separated from a second portion via a sandwiched insulating layer) of the outer frame while forming a second electrical conducting path that connects the second portion (electrically separated from the first portion via the sandwiched insulating layer) of the inner frame to the second portion (electrically separated from the first portion via the sandwiched insulating layer) of the outer frame.

Fig. 13C of McClelland et al. (U.S. 6,201,629) shows a structure wherein an inner frame 41 is connected to an outer frame 40 by a multilayered spring support which comprises an insulating layer 54, a lower conducting layer 55 and an upper conducting layer 56. However, the insulating

layer 54 and the two conducting layers 55, 56 do not form any part of the inner frame 41 nor of the outer frame 40.

According to the present invention, the claimed first portions, second portions and insulating layer are portions that form the inner frame and the outer frame. Therefore, the Office Action has improperly equated the three different layers 54-56 of McClelland with the present claimed elements.

In Figs. 1b and 1c of McDonald (U.S. 5,774,604), all of the torsion bars are actually shown to be connected to portions of the mirror 10 (switch structure) which are not electrically separated from each other. The Office Action's holding that the torsion bars of McDonald are capable of providing two electrically separate conductive paths is unsubstantiated because the document itself does not disclose or suggest the same.

None of the references, or their combination, teach or suggest the present claimed structure wherein at least one 251 of the torsion bars (connected to a same side of the inner frame) connects the upper first portion 221 (as already defined) of the inner frame 220 to the upper first portion 231 (as already defined) of the outer frame 230 to provide a first electrical conducting path, while at least another 252 of the torsion bars (connected to a same side of the inner frame) connects the lower second portion 222 (as already defined) of the inner frame 220 to the lower second portion 234 (as already defined) of the outer frame 230 to provide a second electrical conducting path which is electrically separate from the first electrical conducting path.

In view of the present amendments to the claims and the above remarks, Applicants' claims 19-29 are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance. Early action towards allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William G. Kratz, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 22,631

WGK/nrp
Atty. Docket No. **011459A**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\NANCY\01\011459A\Amendment filed 5-25-06